



Office of the Attorney General
State of Texas

DAN MORALES
ATTORNEY GENERAL

June 24, 1998

Ms. Anne M. Constantine
Legal Counsel
Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport
P.O. Drawer 619428
DFW Airport, Texas 75261-9428

OR98-1525

Dear Ms. Constantine:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 116056.

The Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport (the "airport") received a request for copies of the bids submitted by A-Net, Inc. and Software Professionals for the Project Coordinator for "Contractors for Year 2000 Compliance" contract. You have released some of the information to the requestor. However, you claim that the remaining portions of the bid proposals are excepted from public disclosure by section 552.110 of the Government Code. You have submitted the information at issue to this office for review.

Since the property and privacy rights of third parties are implicated by the release of the requested information here, this office notified A-Net, Inc. and Software Professionals of the request. See Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Government Code section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Open Records Act in certain circumstances).

Section 552.110 protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of "trade secret" from the Restatement of Torts, section 757, which holds a "trade secret" to be:

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is

used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to a single or ephemeral event in the conduct of the business A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. . . . [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). If a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the "trade secrets" branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a prima facie case for exception and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990) at 5.¹

In Open Records Decision No. 639 (1996), this office announced that it would follow the federal courts' interpretation of exemption 4 to the federal Freedom of Information Act when applying the second prong of section 552.110 for commercial and financial information. In *National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974), the court concluded that for information to be excepted under exemption 4 to the Freedom of Information Act, disclosure of the requested information must be likely either to (1) impair the government's ability to obtain necessary information in the future, or (2) cause substantial harm to the competitive position of the person from whom the information was obtained. A business enterprise cannot succeed in a *National Parks* claim by a mere conclusory assertion of a possibility of commercial harm. Open Records Decision No. 639 (1996) at 4. To prove substantial competitive harm, the party seeking to prevent disclosure must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure. *Id.*


¹The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are: "(1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company]; (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company's] business; (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information; (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors; (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information; (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS, § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 (1982) at 2, 306 (1982) at 2, 255 (1980) at 2.

A-Net, Inc. argues that portions of its proposal are confidential and contain commercial and financial information. A-Net, Inc. has not established that the information it seeks to withhold is either a trade secret or confidential commercial or financial information that must be withheld. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 639 (1996) at 4 (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure), 552 (1990) at 5 (party must establish prima facie case that information is trade secret). Therefore, the airport must release the requested information pertaining to A-Net, Inc. to the requestor.

Software Professionals Inc. contends that portions of its proposal are confidential and proprietary, and that release of these portions would place it at a competitive disadvantage. Software Professionals Inc. has not established that the information it seeks to withhold is either a trade secret or confidential commercial or financial information that must be withheld. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 639 (1996) at 4 (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure), 552 (1990) at 5 (party must establish prima facie case that information is trade secret). Therefore, the airport must release the requested information pertaining to Software Professionals Inc. to the requestor.

We are resolving this matter with an informal letter ruling rather than with a published open records decision. This ruling is limited to the particular records at issue under the facts presented to us in this request and should not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records. If you have questions about this ruling, please contact our office.

Yours very truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Yen-Ha Le' with a stylized flourish at the end.

Yen-Ha Le
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

YHL/nc

Ref: ID# 116056

Enclosures: Submitted documents

cc: Mr. Jack Lagos
Professional Services
2809 Regal Road
Suite 100
Plano, Texas 75075
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Annette S. Park
President
A-Net, Inc.
685 Timber Bend
Highland Village, Texas 75067
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Reena Batra
President
Software Professionals Inc.
1200 Walnut Hill Lane, Suite 1300
Irving, Texas 75038
(w/o enclosures)